IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

MATTHEW T. CHAPMAN and
MARK C. CHAPMAN,
Petitioners,
vs.
JOHN A. WINTROATH.

October Term, 1918. No. 456.

Motion to Advance.

Now come Matthew T. Chapman and Mark C. Chapman, the petitioners in the above-entitled cause, by their counsel, and move that said cause be advanced for argument at an early date in accordance with the provisions of Paragraph 5, Rule 26, on the ground that the questions presented therein for determination concern the administration of the Patent Office of the United States and involve matters of general public interest, to-wit, whether or not an applicant for a patent is estopped from making claims of a patent for interference purposes after the expiration of one year from the date of issue of the patent.

JOHN L. JACKSON,
ALBERT H. ADAMS,
Counsel for Petitioners.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

MATTHEW T. CHAPMAN and MARK C. CHAPMAN, *Petitioners,* vs. JOHN A. WINTROATH.

October Term, 1918. No. 456.

Stipulation.

Whereas counsel for the respondent do not object to the granting of the accompanying Motion to Advance, it is stipulated by counsel for the parties to the above entitled cause that said motion may be submitted to the Supreme Court of the United States at the convenience of counsel for the petitioners without further notice.

JOHN L. JACKSON,
ALBERT H. ADAMS,
Counsel for Petitioners.

PAUL SYNNESTVEDT,
HARVEY L. LECHNER,
Counsel for Respondents.

In the Supreme Court of the United States.

OCTOBER TERM, 1918.

MATTHEW T. CHAPMAN AND MARK C. Chapman, petitioners,
v.
JOHN A. WINTROATH.

No. 456.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

SUGGESTION BY THE UNITED STATES.

Comes now the Solicitor General on behalf of the United States and respectfully submits to the court the following suggestion in connection with petitioners' motion to advance the above entitled case for early hearing:

While the Government is not a party to this case it respectfully calls the court's attention to the fact that the same presents a question of public interest, namely, the rule or practice to be pursued by the Patent Office in determining the question of priority in interference proceedings pending before it; also the further question as to whether section 4886 or section 4894 of the Revised Statutes lays down the true rule or practice in such cases.

98343—19

Numerous applications for patents are now pending in the Patent Office upon which action has been suspended awaiting a decision in the instant case.

The Department of the Interior at the suggestion of the Commissioner of Patents has requested ~~that~~ that application be made for an early hearing of the case.

ALEX. C. KING,
Solicitor General.

JANUARY, 1919.

○